

## **REMARKS**

### **The Amendments**

The claims are amended to address the new claim objections and 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter disclosed in the application which has been canceled by any of the above amendments.

### **The Claim Objections**

The objections to the claims are believed to be rendered moot by the above amendments.

### **The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The rejection of claims 9, 13, 14 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

As to the “derivatives” term, applicants respectfully point out that claim 9 specifically defined the nature and scope of the meaning of the “derivatives” term in limited and definite way. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution of this application, the claim has been amended to remove the term and only recite the salts term. Thus, this part of the rejection is believed to be rendered moot.

The claims containing the “including” term are canceled or amended to remove the term. Thus, this part of the rejection is believed to be rendered moot.

Claims 24-29 are canceled, rendering the part of the rejection directed thereto moot.

The part of the rejection directed to claim 30 is respectfully traversed. The terms such as “PDE IV or VII inhibitors,” tryptase inhibitors,” and “MAP kinase inhibitors” are not “relative terms” as alleged in the Office action. Relative terms are terms such as “higher” or “stronger.” The terms objected to here are not relative in any sense. The terms define classes of therapeutic agents which are well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art in the pharmaceutical arts is well aware of the meaning and metes and bounds of these terms. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art could carry out routine experimentation using known assays to determine whether a specific therapeutic agent is within such a class of agents. Additionally, the instant application provides a great deal of guidance to the reader on the nature of the additional therapeutic agent. Claim 30 itself evidences the wealth of guidance provided to applicants for selecting an appropriate additional therapeutic agent. Applicants thus urge that the nature and scope of the claimed invention is clearly conveyed to one of ordinary skill in the art and the rejection should be withdrawn.

For the above reasons, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

**The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

The rejection of claims 9, 13, 14 and 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is believed to be rendered moot by the above amendments which remove the “prodrug” recitation. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Sopp/  
John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33,103  
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Direct Dial: 703-812-5311  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410  
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-2983

Date: December 21, 2007

JAS/hlw